



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/733,607	12/11/2003	Robert W. Erickson	RCM 03324	8510	
7590 04/28/2005		•	EXAMINER		
JAMES RAY & ASSOCIATES 2640 PITCAIRN ROAD MONROEVILLE, PA 15146			SINGH, SUNIL		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		3673		
			DATE MAILED: 04/28/200	DATE MAILED: 04/28/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/		lo(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		w Summary (PTO-413)			
Attachment(s)					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a		ot received.			
application from the International Bur	•	on 10001100 in this Hational Stage			
2. Certified copies of the priority docume3. Copies of the certified copies of the p					
1. Certified copies of the priority docume		Application No.			
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	ign priority under 35 U.S.C	. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
	Lammer, Note the attach	Ca Chice Action of John F 10-132.			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	•	***			
Applicant may not request that any objection to t					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 18 February 2005 is					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam					
Application Papers					
are subject to restriction and	u/or election requirement.				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement				
6) Claim(s) <u>1-12,16 and 18-20</u> is/are rejected.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without	•				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12,16 and 18-20</u> is/are pending i	n the application.				
Disposition of Claims					
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C	.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allow					
·-	2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final.				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on		Ĺ			
Status					
after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a length of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion from the period for reply will, by state that the period for reply will, by state than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) Mo tute, cause the application to become	ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR		a reply be timely filed			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REI	PLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3	MONTH(S) FROM			
Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address			
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	Sunil Singh	3673			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	10/733,607	ERICKSON, ROBERT W.			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			

Art Unit: 3673

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1,6-12,16,18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Krekeler (US 3331637)

Krekeler discloses a retaining system (see Fig. 4) for securing a cutting tool to a support block, said retaining system comprising: at least one groove (22) having a first predetermined shape, formed in an outer surface of a shank portion of said cutting tool intermediate each end thereof, said groove being formed in a direction transverse to a longitudinal axis of said shank; at least one groove (23) having a second predetermined shape, formed in a surface of a bore formed through an axis of said support block for receiving therein said shank portion of said cutting tool, said at least one groove formed in said outer surface of said shank portion of said cutting tool being substantially radially opposed to said at least one groove formed in said surface of said bore formed through said axis of said support block when said shank portion is inserted into said bore of said support block; and at least one rolled spring steel pin member (24) (see col. 4 lines 15-25) engageable with each of said at least one groove formed in said outer surface of said shank portion said cutting tool and said at least one groove formed in said surface of said bore formed through said axis

Application/Control Number: 10/733,607 Page 3

Art Unit: 3673

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1,6-12, 16, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snipe or Morrow or Krekeler '206 or Krekeler '728 or Hansen et al. or Krekeler '764 or Kniff et al., Krekeler '359 or Vasek or Stewart (US 3268260, 3498677, 3622206, 3690728, 3796464, 3834764, 3841708, 3856359, 4222446, 5810102) in view of Krekeler '637 or Parsons (US 5357823).

Snipe, Morrow, Krekeler '206, Krekeler '728, Hansen et al., Krekeler '764, Kniff et al., Krekeler '359, Vasek and Stewart all disclose a retaining system for securing a cutting tool to a support block, said retaining system comprising: at least one groove, having a first predetermined shape, formed in an outer surface of a shank portion of said cutting tool intermediate each end thereof, said groove being formed in a direction transverse to a longitudinal axis of said shank; at least one groove, having a second predetermined shape, formed in a surface of a bore formed through an axis of said support block for receiving therein said shank portion of said cutting tool, said at least one groove formed in said outer surface of said shank portion of said cutting tool being substantially radially opposed to said at least one groove formed in said surface of said bore formed through said axis of said support block when said shank portion is inserted into said bore of said support block; and at least one pin member engageable with each of said at least one

Art Unit: 3673

groove formed in said outer surface of said shank portion said cutting tool and said at least one groove formed in said surface of said bore formed through said axis of said support block for securing said cutting tool to said support block (see Figures).

However, they all are silent about the pin being rolled spring steel. Krekeler '637 and Parsons both teach rolled spring steel pin (24, 114 respectively). It would have been considered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify either Snipe, Morrow, Krekeler '206, Krekeler '728, Hansen et al., Krekeler '764, Kniff et al., Krekeler '359, Vasek and Stewart by substituting the pin as taught by either Krekeler '637 or Parsons for the pin disclosed by Snipe, Morrow, Krekeler '206, Krekeler '728, Hansen et al., Krekeler '764, Kniff et al., Krekeler '359, Vasek and Stewart since this would facilitate insertion because such a pin will contract to permit insertion and due to its resiliency property rebound to retain the cutting tool in its holder.

5. Claims 1, 3-12, 16, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bower, Jr. (US 3493268) in view of Krekeler '637 or Parsons '823. Bower, Jr. discloses the invention substantially as claimed (see Figures). However, Bower, Jr. is silent about the pin being rolled spring steel. Krekeler '637 and Parsons both teach rolled spring steel pin (24, 114 respectively). It would have been considered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Bower, Jr. by substituting the pin as taught by either Krekeler '637 or Parsons for the pin disclosed by Bower, Jr. since this would facilitate insertion because such a pin will contract to permit insertion and due to its resiliency property rebound to retain the cutting tool in its holder.

Application/Control Number: 10/733,607 Page 5

Art Unit: 3673

6. Claims 1, 2-12, 16, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wipo document (WO 00/34626) in view of Krekeler '637.

Wipo '626 discloses the invention substantially as claimed (see Figure 16). However, Wipo '626 is silent about including a groove in the shank of the cutting tool and wherein the pin therein being rolled spring steel. Krekeler '637 teaches rolled spring steel pin (24) within the groove of a shank (see Fig. 4). It would have been considered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Wipo '626 by substituting the cutting tool with its pin as taught by Krekeler '637 for the cutting tool and pin disclosed by Wipo '626 since this would facilitate insertion because such a pin will contract to permit insertion and due to its resiliency property rebound to retain the cutting tool in its holder.

Response to Arguments

- 7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 8. In response to applicant's argument that Bowers, Jr. fails to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "non-reversible) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sunil Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-7051. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 10:30 AM - 7:00 PM.

Art Unit: 3673

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Shackelford can be reached on (571) 272-7049. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sunil Singh Primary Examiner Annil Ling L

Art Unit 3673

SS 4/25/05

SUMIL SINGH PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER